

**REMARKS**

Applicants express their appreciation for the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 4. Claim 3 is amended in independent form thereby rendering claims 3 and 4 in condition for allowance.

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an Appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. The amendments to the subject claims do not incorporate any new subject matter into the claims. Thus, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Sautter (U.S. Patent No. 4,006,821). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sautter discloses a container for storing a plurality of elongated objects such as drill bits that includes a body member and a plurality of object-storing trays pivotally connected at one end with said body member for pivotal movement about a common pivot axis. The trays are automatically displaced from stacked retracted positions within the body member toward extended positions in which the other ends of the trays extend outwardly from the body member in accordance with the movement of a lid member that is pivotally connected with the body member.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a storage case that includes a case body, a case cover, a supporting plate having a support plate cutout and a four-link mechanism. Claim 1 recites that the four-link mechanism includes a first hinge pivotally supporting the case body and the case cover at a case body base end in an openable/closeable manner, a second hinge via which the base end of the supporting plate is pivotally supported by the case body at the base body base end in an openable/closeable manner such that the holding segment of the supporting plate faces the case body, and a third hinge and a fourth hinge via which opposite

ends of an arm segment disposed between the supporting plate and the case cover are pivotally supported by the supporting plate and the case cover in an openable/closeable manner such that, upon opening or closing the case cover relative to the case body, the support plate and the case cover move simultaneously with one another. Claim 1 also recites that when the case cover is being closed over the case body in a state in which said at least one portion of the object to be stored is held by the holding segment of the supporting plate, the object to be stored is rotated so as to be positioned below the supporting plate, whereby the object to be stored and the supporting plate become stored in a storing position of the case body, and wherein when the case cover is being opened from the case body, the stored object is rotated so as to be positioned above the supporting plate, whereby the stored object and the supporting plate are drawn out from the case body. Claim 1 further recites that, upon closing the case cover relative to the case body, the support plate, the second hinge, the third hinge and the fourth hinge are enclosed within the case cover and the case body and the support plate cutout receives the arm segment.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each and every element of claim 1, as now amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach that, upon closing the case cover relative to the case body, the support plate, the second hinge, the third hinge and the fourth hinge are enclosed within the case cover and the case body and the support plate cutout receives the arm segment. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this Amendment is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to set forth further arguments and remarks supporting the

patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Dated: September 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_

Ronald P. Kananek

Registration No.: 24,104

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 955-3750  
Attorney for Applicant

Enclosure(s):              Amendment Transmittal

DC325199.DOC